

ପ୍ରକାଶକ ମେଳାମେଲୀ

“Proposed Amendment for Interim Review Purposes Only”

Decomposition Transitions:

Confirmation via Mail: YES NO

Total Pages:

To:	Examiner Paula, Cesar B.	From:	D. Kent Stier/Blake Sorenson	Group Art Unit: 2178	US Serial No.: 09/755,418	Our Ref.: 60001.0009US01/M150S3.01	Fax No.: 571.273.0107	Phone No.: 571.272.4128	Fax No.: 404.954.5099	Phone No.: 404.954.5066/5047
-----	--------------------------	-------	------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

Fax Transmission | March 14, 2008

A Practical Application

፩፻፲፭ የፌዴራል አስተዳደር ማኅበር ተቋማ

Page 404 of 509

www.iapt.org/standards.htm

MerciaNet & Gold

****PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR INTERVIEW PURPOSES ONLY****

S/N: 09/755,418

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Ferreira, et al. Examiner: Paula, Cesar B.
Serial No.: 09/755,418 Group Art Unit: 2178
Filed: January 5, 2001 Docket No.: 60001.0009US01/MS150535.01
Title: Method of Removing Personal Information From an Electronic Document

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

AMENDMENT

In response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2008, please reexamine and reconsider the application in view of the amendments and appended remarks.

Remarks/Arguments follow the amendment sections of this paper.

****PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR INTERVIEW PURPOSES ONLY****

S/N: 09/755,418

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 19 and 30 are independent. In the Office Action dated January 25, 2008, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. **Interview Summary**

Applicants thank Examiner Paula for the courtesy of a telephone interview on _____, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, _____

<Note: Interview currently being scheduled.>

II. **Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action dated January 25, 2008 the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Star Office 5.1 Memorandum ("StarOffice") in view of U.S. Pub. Patent App. No. 2004/0049294 A1 ("Keene"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because combining StarOffice with Keene would not have led to the claimed invention.

Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "saving the first document with the generic

information replacing the removed personal information, wherein saving the first document further comprises, in response to activating the privacy option, replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first document and a file representation of the first document.”

Independent Claims 11, 19, and 30 each includes a similar recitation.

As stated by the Examiner, StarOffice does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. (See Office Action, pages 3-4.) The Examiner further states that Keene teaches the blocking or removing of data from a document deemed sensitive by a user.

(See Office Action, page 4.) Applicants respectfully submit that Keene does not teach or disclose, saving the document with the generic information replacing the removed personal information in response to activating a privacy option, replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first document and a file representation of the first document.”

Keene merely discloses retrieving information pertaining to an individual user's privilege to removed personal information in response to activating a privacy option. Rather, however, each or disclose, saving the document with the generic information replacing criteria and determining which information contained in a database may be accessed by a requestor. (See Keene, para. [0007].) In Keene, when a guest user requests access to an object, a retention system extracts the requestor's user ID. (See Keene, para. [0047].) The user ID in Keene is matched with predetermined privilege identifications [0047].) Nowhere does Keene disclose removing personal information from a document without regard to verifying individual user privileges to view such personal information. Rather, the retention system in Keene maintains such personal information in the document for display to users with privileges to see it.

****PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR INTERVIEW PURPOSES ONLY****

S/N: 09/755,418

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine *Staroffice* and *Keene* because of the reasons found in *Keene*, including maintaining trade secrets, confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that removing personal information from both the file and memory representations of a document provides additional utility not taught or disclosed by *Keene*. Removing such information allows widespread document distribution without requiring all recipients verify user credentials in order to determine which information should be redacted. (See Specification, page 1, lines 25-30.) Therefore, *Keene* does not disclose saving a document with generic information replacing removed personal information without regard to a user privilege level.

Combining *Staroffice* with *Keene* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Staroffice* and *Keene*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "saving the first document with the generic information replacing the removed personal information, wherein saving the first document further comprises, in response to activating the privacy option, replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first document and a file representation of the first document," as recited by Claim 1. Independent Claims 11, 19, and 30 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30.

****PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR INTERVIEW PURPOSES ONLY****

S/N: 09/755,418

Dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27-29 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27-29.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

****PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR INTERVIEW PURPOSES ONLY****

S/N: 09/755,418

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date:

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:sm

